



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,286	01/25/2000	Rose K. Davis	M-8086 US	8352

23640 7590 08/27/2003

BAKER BOTTS, LLP
910 LOUISIANA
HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER

PWU, JEFFREY C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/491,286

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey Pwu

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/6/2003 amendment.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 25-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call (US 6,154,738) in view of Miller et al. (US 2002/0029181)

3. Call teaches a method of selling hardware substantially claimed including:

providing modified hardware including original hardware provided by a manufacturer, the modified hardware having at least one part either added to or removed from the original hardware (Col.4, line 1-col.5, line26; “the present invention enables the retrieval of information about products from the source of those products, typically the manufacturer, by those who need that information such as re-sellers and consumers...”;

sending a request to a computer, the request including a unique code (Product Code) provided by the manufacturer to uniquely identify an original hardware description of the original hardware; receiving the original hardware description (col.5, line 29-col.8, line 60);

modifying description to accurately describe the modified hardware (col.11, line 61-col.14, line 2); and

transmitting the modified hardware description to an online auction database (“inventory database”; fig.7).

However, Call fails to disclose a unique code being manufacturer-supplied code.

Miller has been cited for teaching the use of bar codes and/or manufacturer-supplied codes, for example, bar codes and/or manufacturer-supplied codes are being used to facilitate the tracking of inventory, to identify a product for re-stocking, to look up the price of an item when a consumer purchase it, to monitor the status of a shipment or delivery (e.g., by tracking its location), to enable a person to access information concerning an item of interest to that user (e.g., a consumer good, an article or document), and to specify information that may be provided to a person who scans or reads the code. (see paragraph [0005], [0006], [0007], [0009], and [0047]). Miller further teaches that simply by scanning a bar code associated with an item a user is interested in, he or she is provided with a variety of data concerning the item. Scanned bar codes, or bar code representations, may be stored prior to transmission to the system in a bar code scanner or a user's computer that is capable of communication with a scanner. The bar codes or representations may be collected during the execution of a set of instructions (e.g., a software or firmware program) operating on the user's computer (e.g., a web browser, utility application, operating system, etc.). And by registering the UPC code with the system, a user can be directed to a network location associated with the manufacturer and/or the specific product. (See paragraph [0046] and [0047])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have used the manufacture-supplied code to facilitate the auction of Call as taught in Miller for the for the explicit reasons discussed above so that a merchant/producer may supply certain information or links to be provided to all or a subset of users who scan the unique code.

Response to Arguments


4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Pwu whose telephone number is (703) 308-7835.


JEFFREY PWU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Aug 22, 2003